



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address : COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER FILING DATE FIRST NAME/INVENTOR ATTORNEY/DOCKET NO
07/916,783 07/17/92 CANTRELL B X-8244A

ELI LILLY AND COMPANY
PATENT DIVISION/MVJ
LILLY CORPORATE CENTER
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46285

EXAMINER
COVINGTON, R

ART UNIT
1203

PATENT NUMBER
3

DATE MAILED: 11/05/92

This is a communication from the Commissioner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on 7/17/92 This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. 2. Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. 4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152.
5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. 6.

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. Claims 1 - 20 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. Claims _____ are allowed.

4. Claims 1 - 20 are rejected.

5. Claims _____ are objected to.

6. Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable. not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).

10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____ has (have) been approved by the examiner. disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____, has been approved. disapproved (see explanation).

12. Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____

13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. Other

Art Unit 1203

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Zimmerman I (450) taken with Zimmerman II (635).

Zimmerman teaches aryl piperdines of the type claimed. See Column 2, lines 55+ and Column 3, lines 1-45 where R₁ is a substituted alkyl and, for example, where X is C. Patentee do not specifically teach an COOH containing derivative. Zimmerman

Serial No. 07/916,783

-3-

Art Unit 1203

(635) teaches analogous compounds where the piperidine is N-substituted with an alkyl containing pharmaceutically acceptable acid addition salt wherein the acid can be organic acid. See Column 1, lines 35-60 and Column 2, lines 33-70. Carboxylic acid being a well-known organic acid certainly would be contemplated by patentee. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth herein above the invention as claimed would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill and therefore unpatentable.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Covington at telephone number (703) 308-4530.

Raymond Covington
**RAYMOND COVINGTON
PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 120 AU 129**

COVINGTON:ebw
October 06, 1992